DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 837 FL 021 414

AUTHOR Geranpayeh, Ardeshir
TITLE Functional Controlled Writing.
REPORT NO ISSN-0959-2253
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 16p.; For serial publication in which this paper appears, see FL 021 410.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics; v4 p40-53 1993

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classification; *Classroom Techniques; College Students; *Communicative Competence (Languages); *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Rhetoric; Second Language Instruction; Testing; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Iran

ABSTRACT

This study reports the results of two experiments involving a focus on the rhetorical functions of generalization and classification in the teaching of the writing skill to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in Iran. The main research question is whether the teaching of language functions is relevant in the development of writing ability in university EFL learners. Results suggest that teaching language functions has a positive effect on the development of this ability. The writing tests used in the experiments are appended. Contains 13 references. (Author/JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 837

Functional Controlled Writing

Ardeshir Geranpayeh (DAL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian Parkinson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL021414

FUNCTIONAL CONTROLLED WRITING

Ardeshir Geranpayeh (DAL)

Abstract

This study reports the results of two experiments involving a focus on the rhetorical functions of generalisation and classification in the teaching of the writing skill to EFL learners in Iran. The main research question is whether the teaching of language functions is relevant in the development of writing ability in university EFL learners. The results suggest that teaching language functions has a positive effect on the development of this ability.

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

English language teaching (ELT) has gone through various stages of development during the last three decades culminating in the emergence of the communicative approach. Much research has been on the effectiveness of adopting a functional approach in the teaching of English as a second language (TESL). Whether functional teaching is feasible in EFL settings has hardly ever been questioned.

In Iran, for example, the official figures speak of about 8 million learners currently learning English at different levels and institutions throughout the country. The rising fever for learning English does not seem to have affected the older generation instructors' methods. The usual practice is that of structural and grammar-translation methods. There is a tendency amongst the adherents of these methods to resist any change in the teaching curriculum. As Hashemi points out,

> even those who are aware of the pitfalls of the generation-old methods and wish to be innovative in their instruction play lip service to the current teaching trends and continue with the inveterate procedures with which they feel secure. (1992:1)

On the other hand, a needs analysis of the learners indicates that English is mainly used, firstly, as a means of reading academic texts and secondly, as a means of expressing learners' ideas through written discourse to English speakers worldwide. These methods seem to serve the learners' needs so that there is hardly any room for the application of any new method. This study, however, is an attempt to investigate the feasibility of applying a functional approach to the teaching of the writing skill in Iran.

The paper begins with a discussion of the "usage-use" dichotomy and its application to the teaching of the writing skill. Then the method of adopting a functional approach to

teaching writing to EFL learners is explained. The results of two experiments are reported and analysed in this regard. Finally, conclusions are drawn and theoretical as well as pedagogical implications are proposed.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 Usage-use dichotomy

It was Widdowson (1978) who first made a distinction between usage and use. He argues that the usage-use distinction is related to Chomsky's competence-performance distinction. Competence 'refers to a person's knowledge of his language, the system of rules which he has mastered so that he is able to produce and understand an indefinite number of sentences' (Crystal 1991). Competence, in Chomskyan terms, is an idealized conception of language as opposed to the concept of performance which is a set of specific utterances produced by native speakers. In other words, competence is the language user's knowledge of abstract linguistic rules; when this knowledge is put into practice, it is called performance. According to Widdowson (ibid.), usage and use are two aspects of performance. Usage is that aspect of performance 'which makes evident the extent to which the language user demonstrates his knowledge of linguistic rules' (ibid:3). Furthermore, Widdowson clarifies the issue when he says:

> use is another aspect of performance: that which makes evident the extent to which the language user demonstrates his ability to use his knowledge of linguistic rules for effective communication. (ibid.)

In short, we see examples of usage in grammar books when knowledge of competence is realized through the citation of sentences which illustrate the rules. Such sentences only reveal the language user's ability to use his linguistic knowledge of rules without any communicative purpose. Instances of use are the result of that knowledge being put into practice for effective communication.

1.2.2 Approaches to the teaching of the writing skill

Having explained the usage-use dichotomy, we now need to discuss the way(s) it can be utilized in the teaching of the writing skill. For the purpose of this study, teaching the writing skill is viewed from two perspectives: traditional and modern. The former is based on usage while the latter is based on use.

1.2.2.1 Traditional: focus on the composing skill

The traditional view usually focuses on the composing skill of the learners. By this, I mean the learners are required to compose grammatical sentences irrespective of their functions within a piece of discourse. Widdowson (1978) holds the same view when he reviews the traditional grammar exercises done in classrooms and concludes that:

> as long as they aim at providing practice in correct sentence construction they are directed at the development of the composing skill without regard to the part this skill plays in the writing ability.(ibid:115)

This is due to the nature of such exercises which concentrate on separate sentences in isolation from a context. Such exercises lack the character of instances of use because

they do not have any communicative purpose. Rather, they are intended to reveal the learner's knowledge of the language system and the ways it is manifested. They are, in other words, exercises in usage.

Then, the question arises as to whether there is any way to introduce a use orientation in the teaching of the writing skill and, if so, whether it is possible to direct usage exercises towards the development of the writing ability.

1.2.2.2 Modern: focus on the writing ability

The development of the writing ability is the main focus of modern approaches to the teaching of the writing skill (see Arnaudet and Barrett 1984; Kaplan, Robert, and Shaw 1983; Mckay and Rosenthal 1980; Raimes 1991; Reid and Lindstorm 1985; Trimble 1985; Zamel 1987). These approaches are mainly based on use orientation. To have a use orientation one has to devise one's exercises in such a way that they aim at developing natural language behaviour. To achieve this goal, Widdowson proposes two kinds of exercises: preparation and exploitation. By the former, he means exercises which precede a reading passage and force the learner to participate in actual writing; by the latter, he means exercises which follow the reading passage and exploit it for the purpose of practice material.

In preparation exercises, the instructor chooses a reading passage which realizes a certain function, e.g. classification. The exercises that precede this reading passage are all directed to the production of a passage similar to the one to be followed. Hence, the comprehension of the new passage becomes easier. Moreover, since the preceding exercises are all based upon composing activities in which students compose sentences, the composing ability of the learners improves. These exercises are different from those of the traditional approach in that they follow a process of gradual approximation.

What is meant by gradual approximation? It is a general strategy exposed to the learner to develop his communicative abilities in the foreign language. According to Widdowson, gradual approximation:

> begins by providing exercises within the scope of the learner's (limited) linguistic competence in English and then gradually realizes its communicative potential by making appeal to the other kinds of knowledge that the learner has.(1979:76-7)

This strategy involves the learner both in usage and use activities, in which the starting point is the sentence and the target is discourse. Therefore, in our language learning pedagogy activities in both usage and use are required. However,the suggestion is that the main orientation should be toward using language as communication. That is, use activities play an important role in pedagogy. The strategy that bridges the gap between usage and use is, then, called gradual approximation. (see Widdowson, 1979: 75-85)

The second kind of use exercises is exploitation. These exercises follow the reading passage and use it for the purpose of practice material. They should exploit the contextualization provided in the reading passage and should 'use the passage as a basis for the development of the writing ability. '(Widdowson 1978:123). As in preparation exercises, the practice of particular aspects of grammar can be associated with the

writing of simple instances of discourse by means of gradual approximation, thus giving it a use orientation. It should, nevertheless, be noticed that the end product is not going to be a simple version of the reading passage any more. Rather, it is going to be an instance of use which is somehow rhetorically related to it,e.g. a summary of the passage.

Gradual approximation can be achieved in exploitation exercises through different approaches. For example, sentence-to-discourse is a common approach. The process used here is very similar in nature to the preparation exercises. Various manipulations will be performed on a group of sentences to yield a simple account based on the examples of use such as definition or description used in the passage. Such a process also provides practice in that aspect of usage found in the passage. Since the procedure is controlled, it can result in the development of more elaborate versions with different degrees of complexity according to the learner's competence. At the end of the exploitation exercises, the learner should be able to write pieces of discourse (paragraphs) functionally similar to those used in the reading passage. Hence, the learner can communicate effectively in writing within the limited scope he has been exposed to. The scope can be enlarged according to the needs of the learners (see ibid: 126-134).

Then comes a crucial question of how effective is the procedure outlined above in the development of the writing ability of EFL learners. This is the focus of the present research.

1.3 Statement of purpose

The main research question of this study can be stated as : 'Is it effective to teach language functions through controlled writing?' The hypothesis is that teaching language functions (as instances of use) through controlled writing should affect the writing ability of the students, in this case EFL learners. This is in accordance with the current trends in the teaching of the writing skill in which use is emphasized. As mentioned earlier, exercises in use involve the learners in actual communication. What is meant by communication in writing? It is a process of non-verbal transfer of information. Paragraphs, for example, are non-verbal carriers of information which the writer adopts to communicate ideas to his readers. Since paragraphs can serve different functions, language functions seem to be necessary parts in any language teaching syllabus based on the characteristics of use.

In brief, language functions resemble the major thought patterns governing a piece of discourse. If a learner internalizes these functions, it is assumed that he should be able to perform them effectively. In the case of writing paragraphs, internalizing the language functions should result in the improvement of the writing ability. The degree of improvement, however, is a matter that this research intends to investigate. Other research questions that were posed are as follows:

1- Is there a hierarchy of difficulty among the functions?

2- If there is a hierarchy of difficulty among the functions, does it affect the learning process(es) of the functions?

The alpha level for all statistical decisions was set at 0.01.

2. Method

2.1 Subjects

Two groups of subjects participated in these experiments, the experimental group and the control group. Treatment was intended to be applied to the experimental group only.

The experimental group (Group A) consisted of 38 first-year Iranian English majors studying at Azad University in Tehran. They all participated in the course "Grammar and Writing II", in which the students were taught to combine simple sentences and construct compound-complex sentences to form paragraphs. The course was based on a usage-oriented method of the kind described earlier. The control group (Group B) consisted of 41 first-year Iranian English majors studying at Shahid Chamran University in Ahwaz. They were also taking the course "Grammar and Writing II" with the same syllabus and method as those of Group A subjects.

In order to assess the subjects' language proficiency, a version of the 100-Multiple Choice Nelson Quickcheck Test - the reliability of which had been reckoned to be 0.93 - was given to both groups. Only those who scored over 50 were selected to take part in the experiments. Thus, 31 and 23 subjects participated in Group A and Group B, respectively. The claim that the groups were homogeneous is based on a t-test conducted to compare the scores of the two groups. The t observed was $t1 = 2.5476$, $d.f. = 52$, $p < 0.01$. This allows us to infer that the groups were homogeneous.

2.2 Materials

The preparation of materials was a very difficult and critical task in these experiments. Two factors had to be taken care of: 1) the relevance of materials to the level and fields of the subjects, and 2) the utilization of preparation and exploitation exercises preceding and following a reading passage for the development of functional writing. Prior to decisions about materials and activities, the functions themselves had to be determined. Language functions can be classified in various ways. However, for the purpose of this research, they are divided into the thematic and the supporting functions. The former, sometimes called rhetorical, refer to very broad functions like generalisation, elaboration, and classification. They usually represent the main propositional development in a piece of discourse.The latter functions deal with supporting acts that link the smaller units of information in a piece of text,i.e., clarification or exemplification (see Widdowson 1978: chapter 5). Supporting functions are,elsewhere (Trimble 1985), equated with rhetorical techniques. They are devices a writer uses to relate the units of information in a paragraph to one another and to relate the paragraphs of a discourse to each other. Moreover, they are termed techniques, for it is not common to find a whole paragraph comprising them.

The two rhetorical functions of generalization and classification, which have wide potential use in most academic areas, were selected. The function of generalization was used in Experiment I and that of classification in Experiment II. The advantages of selecting two functions are as follows. Firstly, a particular function might, for various reasons, be perceived with difficulty by the learner, and such difficulty or simplicity may influence the results. Secondly, there might be a hierarchy of difficulty in learning functions, i.e. one function may be learned better than the other. The selection of the second function will clear the ground.

To control the teaching situation of the two experiments, it was decided to focus only on one rhetorical technique (one pattern) for the development of both generalization and classification. This led to the selection of exemplification as the appropriate rhetorical technique for the development of the functions.

Having determined the functions, some passages featuring generalisation and classification supported by exemplification were adapted and (carefully) organized to fulfil the requirements of the preparation and exploitation exercises. The researcher prepared two syllabuses for the treatment in the experiments. The syllabuses consisted of two main parts, namely Presentation and Exploitation. Both the teacher and the students were provided with the syllabuses during the treatment.

2.3 Procedure

2.3.1 Treatment

In Experiment I the subjects in Group A were required to attend two 90-minute sessions on two successive days. The presentation section consisted of two parts: (a) making the subjects familiar with the statements of general and specific information, and (b) checking their comprehension with questions regarding general and specific points. Then, the subjects were given a reading passage followed by exploitation exercises. These exercises required the subjects to find general and specific terms or to complete diagrams representing the outline of the passage. The same procedure was applied to some other passages within the syllabus. Some of the activities required the learners to form sentences from jigsaw words. Then, the subjects were supposed to join the sentences thus formed to complete a paragraph. The role that each sentence played within the paragraph was underlined and the subjects were allowed to add any transitional marker (rhetorical signal) that established the coherence of the paragraph.

In Experiment II, the subjects in Group A were taught the function of classification. The same procedures as those of Experiment I were adopted. This time, however, the emphasis was on the formation of categories (classifications) and their members, on the basis of their shared features. The treatment was then complete.

2.3.2 Evaluation

Based on the results of an earlier pilot study conducted on other subjects, it was decided to have the subjects write a controlled paragraph for each experiment. The paragraphs were divided into 5/6 single statements. Each statement had some missing words followed by a parenthesis which included some of the words needed to complete the statements. Moreover, the function/technique resembling each statement was underlined (see Appendices A and B). The subjects were required to complete the

sentences and to add the necessary words that established the coherence of the paragraphs. Finally, they had to write their paragraphs on separate sheets of paper. These tests were distributed among both the experimental and the control groups. The paragraphs thus formed were then collected for evaluation.

The next task was to choose a criterion for evaluation. The existing criteria for evaluating the writing skill (discussed by Jacobs et al. 1981) were neither objective nor adequate for this research. Therefore, it was decided to devise a new criterion of assessment based on three factors: the function that each sentence played within the paragraph (F); the rhetorical signal used (R) if it were necessary; and the grammaticality of the sentences (G). The following grading system was employed for each sentence: 2 points to each sentence if the desired function /technique was fully performed; 1 point if the proper rhetorical signal was used; and 1 point if the grammaticality of the sentence was observed. A negative point was given to those sentences violating the normal form,i.e. the subject did not use all the words provided in parentheses for writing the sentences. Table 1 shows how each paragraph was scored.

TABLE 1
Evaluation Format

	SENTENCE						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Σ
F	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
R	• -	1	1	• -	1	• -	3
G	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
V	@ -	@ -	@ -	@ -	@ -	@ -	@ -
Σ	3	4	4	3	4	3	21

F= Function
R= Rhetorical Signal
G= Grammaticality
• No rhetorical signal required
@ No violation in constructing the sentence
V= Violation (negative score)
Σ= Total Score

The paragraphs were then numbered and shuffled. The paragraphs were rated by a second judge in addition to the researcher. Later, the results of the two scores were compared. The degrees of correlation between the two raters' scores for the experimental group were $r1$=0.86 and $r2$= 0.88 in Experiment I and Experiment II, respectively, and those for the control group were $r3$= 0.93 and $r4$= 0.93 in the experiments, respectively. The high correlations thus confirmed the objectivity of the evaluation procedure.

3. Results

3.1 Experiment I

To find out whether the difference between the writing scores of the two groups was significant, a t-test was performed. The t-test revealed that the experimental group scored significantly higher than the control group, $t2$= 8.4421, $d.f.$= 47, p<0.01. Other statistical results obtained are given in table 2.

TABLE 2
Mean Scores of the Subjects on Each Individual
Factor Affecting the Total Writing Score:
Experiment I

	Group A						Group B				
	F	R	G	V	Σ		F	R	G	V	Σ
Mean	9.1	2.1	2.5	.44	13.4	X	3.7	.33	.71	.4	4.38
%	91	70	50	44	74	%	37	11	14	38	24

F= Function
R= Rhetorical Signal
G= Grammaticality
V= Violation
Σ= Total Mean
X= Mean score

3.2 Experiment II

Another t-test was performed on the writing scores of the two groups of subjects in Experiment II. The t-test, once again, revealed that the difference between the two mean scores of the two groups was significant,$t3$= 5.023, $d.f.$= 40, p<.01. Table 3 illustrates the average scores of the subjects on each individual factor affecting the total writing score in the experiment.

TABLE 3
Mean Scores of the Subjects on Each Individual
Factor Affecting the Total Writing Score:
Experiment II

	Group A						Group B				
	F	R	G	V	Σ		F	R	G	V	Σ
Mean	10.8	1.2	4	.6	15.4	X	7.9	.04	2.2	.7	9.4
%	89.6	41	81	62	73	%	66	1.3	36	73	45

F= Function
R= Rhetorical Signal
G= Grammaticality
V= Violation
Σ= Total Mean
X= Mean score

3.3 Experiment I VS Experiment II

Table 4 contrasts table 2 of the first experiment with table 3 of the second experiment.

TABLE 4
Contrasting the Details of Mean Scores of the Factors
Affecting the Total Writing Score:
Experiment I VS Experiment II

	Group A						Group B				
	F	R	G	V	Σ		F	R	G	V	Σ
EXP	9.1	2.1	2.5	.44	13.4	X	3.7	.33	.71	.4	4.38
I	91	70	50	44	74	%	37	11	14	38	24
EXP	10.8	1.2	4	.6	15.4	X	7.9	.04	2.2	.7	9.4
II	89.6	41	81	62	73	%	66	1.3	36	73	45

F= Function
R= Rhetorical Signal
G= Grammaticality
V= Violation
Σ= Total Mean
X= Mean Score

It reveals the following. Firstly, Group B subjects scored significantly better in Experiment II than in Experiment I, $t4 = 3.9149$, $d.f. = 40$, $p < 0.01$. Secondly, there was no meaningful difference between the mean scores of the two experiments for Group A subjects, $t5 = 2.3358$, $d.f. = 47$, $p < 0.01$. Thirdly, the rhetorical signals used for the function of classification were more difficult than those used for that of generalization. Group A scored 70% and 41% while Group B scored 11% and 1.3% in Experiments I and II, respectively. Finally, the grammaticality of the sentences in Experiment II had improved when compared to that of Experiment I: 50% and 81% for Group A, and 14% and 36% for Group B in Experiments I and II, respectively.

4. Discussion

The t-tests (t2 and t3) performed in these experiments confirmed the idea that there was a meaningful difference between the mean scores of the two groups after the treatment. Group A scored significantly higher than Group B in both experiments. Since there was no significant difference between the two groups (t1) before the experiments, this would seem to suggest that the improvement in the scores of the experimental group was due to the treatment they had received. That means the teaching of the functions appears to have affected the writing ability of the learners.

A word of caution. This research was conducted on intact groups. Every effort was made to control possible extraneous factors which might have affected the results. But like all other research of this kind, it has its limitations. The great difference between the writing abilities of the two groups after the experiments might cast doubt on the results and suggest that perhaps one group was somehow severely disadvantaged. But this was not the case. Applying treatment to only one group may disadvantage the other group in any experimental design. Giving the advantage of treatment to the experimental group is the procedure normally adopted in experimental designs. The purpose is to test whether the 'advantage' is really an advantage, leading to meaningful changes in the performance of the subjects. If it does change the performance, which in the case of this research it did, it is usually interpreted that perhaps it was due to the treatment effect the subjects had received. It was argued in section 1 that practice in usage, unless accompanied by practice in use, does not automatically yield instances of use. In developing writing ability, mere exercises in composing, which both groups were exposed to, does not necessarily lead to the development of writing ability. Returning to the present research, only the experimental group who were exposed to use activities, in addition to usage ones, were able to perform significantly better in writing. This, furthermore, may indicate the reason for the great difference between the two groups; perhaps the control group, because they were exposed only to composing exercises, could not develop their writing ability during the time limit of this research. In either case the importance of use activities in the development of writing ability cannot be ignored.

Moreover, one may conclude from t4 that the function of classification was an easier task than that of generalization for Group B subjects, that is to say, that there is a hierarchy of difficulty between the functions. However, t5 illustrates that, even if there were such a hierarchy, it did not affect statistically the learning of the language functions by the experimental group. Group A performed equally well on both functions. This may lead us to the conclusion that in learning the language functions, the simplicity or the difficulty of those functions does not seem to play a significant role.

Finally, the results reveal that the rhetorical signals used in Experiment II were more difficult than those in Experiment I for all subjects. It can be seen that the rhetorical signals employed in Experiment I are **for example, for instance**, and **such as**. These signals all indicate that an exemplification is to follow. The rhetorical signals required in Experiment II are **first, second**, and **third**. Although these can also be considered signals of exemplification, they indicate that a kind of enumeration is going to take place. These rhetorical signals, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), are among 'temporal conjunctions'. They differ from all other rhetorical signals in that they do 'occur in a CORRELATIVE form, with a cataphoric time expression in one sentence anticipating the anaphoric one that is to follow'(1976: 263). That is, once a learner uses the rhetorical signal **first**, he is inclined to use **second**, etc. On the other hand, if he misses the first signal, it will be difficult for him to anticipate the next. Returning to the present study, the difficulty of temporal conjunctions for the subjects might be due to the fact that once they missed the first signal, i.e. **first**, they could not anticipate the next. This may be why it appeared in the results that perhaps the rhetorical signals of Experiment II were more difficult than those of Experiment I.

5. Conclusions

We have argued in this paper that, in spite of the large amount of research into communicative teaching, little attention has been given to the feasibility of the approach in the teaching of writing in EFL settings. To test whether this method of teaching is applicable to teaching writing to EFL learners, two experiments were conducted. The experiments were carried out to determine the effectiveness of functional teaching in the development of the writing ability of EFL learners. The results suggested that the method was effective and feasible if a process of controlled writing was intended.

The study can contribute to writing research in two respects, theoretical and pedagogical. As far as theoretical implications are concerned, the following conclusion is plausible. Language functions play an important role in the development of the writing ability of EFL learners. The results of this research showed that those learners who had acquired the language functions could perform better in their writing task.

This study has pedagogical as well as theoretical implications. Practitioners can take insights from this research for their classroom activities. The findings of the present study will benefit those EFL teachers willing to adopt a communicative approach to the teaching of the writing skill. They can use the same procedure adopted here: the process of gradual approximation. Finally, it was also found that controlled writing appeared to be an appropriate means for teaching the functions of the English language. This method of teaching the language functions involves the learners in the process of gradual approximation.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Alan Davies, Margaret Murphy, and an anonymous EWPAL reviewer for their insightful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper.

References

Arnaudet M.L. and M.E. Barrett.1984. Approaches to Academic Reading and Writing. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Crystal D. 1991. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell.

Halliday M.A.K. and R. Hasan. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hashemi Mohammad Reza. 1992. 'Feasibility of functional approach to EFL teaching in Iran'. Unpublished paper presented at TESOL '92 Convention, Vancouver.

Jacobs H.L., S.A. Zinkgraf, D.R. Wormuth, V.F. Hartfiel and J.B. Hughey. 1981. Testing ESL Composition. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Kaplan R.B. and P.A. Shaw. 1983. Exploring Academic Discourse. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Mckay S. and L. Rosenthal. 1980. Writing for a Specific Purpose. Englewood Cliffs,N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Raimes A. 1991. 'Out of the woods: emerging traditions in the teaching of writing'. TESOL Quarterly 25/3: 407-30.

Reid J.M. and M. Lindstrom. 1985. The Process of Paragraph Writing. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Trimble L. 1985. English for Science and Technology: a Discourse Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson H.G. 1978. Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson H.G. 1979. Explorations in Applied Linguistics (Vol.1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zamel V. 1987. 'Recent research on writing pedagogy'. TESOL Quarterly 21: 697-715.

Appendix A

Writing test used in experiment I

Instructions: Construct a paragraph based on the incomplete sentences using the words in parentheses. Add necessary words that establish the coherence of the paragraph. The role that each sentence plays within the paragraph is underlined. Write your paragraph on a separate sheet of paper.

Words and Meanings

-- ..... most interesting ..... actual names ..... which ..... associated ..... meanings of the words.

(some, words, English, are, people)

GENERALISATION

-- ..... boycott, ... , ... the case of ..... who ..... by his .....

(word, derive, Sir Charles Boycott, ostracised, tenants)

EXEMPLIFICATION OF WORDS

-- ..... levi's; these popular ..... Levi Strauss who .....

(is, blue jeans, named, after, first, manufacturer, jeans)

ANOTHER EXEMPLIFICATION

-- Perhaps the most ..... sandwich, named for ..... who .....

(is, Fourth Earl of Sandwich, created, quick, portable, meal)

ANOTHER EXEMPLIFICATION

-- ..... this unique category.....

(words, include, lynch, watt, davenport, zeppelin)

CONCLUDING SENTENCE: FURTHER EXAMPLES

Appendix B

Writing test used in experiment II

Instructions: *Construct a paragraph based on the incomplete sentences using the words in parentheses. Add necessary words that establish the coherence of the paragraph. The role that each sentence plays within the paragraph is underlined. Write your paragraph on a separate sheet of paper.*

Your Library

-- There are ..... kinds ..... be found .....

(three, basic, materials, can, good, library)

TOPIC SENTENCE: CLASSIFICATION

-- ..... on all subjects, ... languages.

(are, books, both, English, other)

FIRST MEMBER EXEMPLIFIED

-- These books ..... according ..... in a ..... called.....

(are, organize, subject, title, author, central, file, card, catalogue)

FURTHER EXEMPLIFICATION OF THE FIRST MEMBER

--... there are.... which include .... and which ....be used..

(reference, works, encyclopedias, bibliographies, dictionaries, must, library)

EXEMPLIFICATION OF THE SECOND MEMBER

-- ..... there are ....._ which are ..... in racks.

(periodicals, magazines, newspapers, pamphlets, filed, alphabetically)

EXEMPLIFICATION OF THE THIRD MEMBER

-- Like ..... , periodicals cannot .....

(reference, works, removed, library)

EXPRESSING A COMMON FEATURE BETWEEN MEMBERS TWO AND THREE

16